

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

MICHAEL L MCGEE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 06-C-721

TIM THOMAS and MIKE LUTZ,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINT**

---

On February 15, 2007, pro se plaintiff Michael McGee filed a document I construed to be a motion to amend complaint. In essence, it appears that McGee simply wants to expand on the allegations in his original complaint that the conditions to which he has been subjected to at Sand Ridge Secure Treatment Center constitute punishment in violation of his due process rights. McGee's motion will be denied for several reasons.

First and foremost, it is unnecessary to expand on the facts alleged in his original complaint. Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is sufficient if a plaintiff gives the defendants notice of his claim; he need not detail every fact in support of it in his initial pleading. *See Loubser v. Thacker*, 440 F.3d 439, 442-43 (7th Cir.2006) (citations omitted) ("Federal pleading entitles a defendant to notice of the plaintiff's claim so that he can prepare responsive pleadings.").

Second, the motion does not comply with the local rules which require that a copy of the proposed new pleading be attached to a motion seeking leave to file. *See* Civil L.R. 15.1 ("Any party submitting a motion to amend must attach to the motion the original of the proposed amended

pleading.”). What McGee has filed is essentially a summary of his interaction with staff at Sand Ridge and a further description of the conditions under which he is confined. He has not provided a copy of the proposed amended complaint that he seeks to file.

For both of these reasons, the motion to file an amended complaint is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED** this 21st day of February, 2007.

s/ William C. Griesbach  
William C. Griesbach  
United States District Judge